











Forever float that standard sheet—  
Where Freedom's flag but falls before us,  
And Freedom's banner streaming o'er us!

Senator Doolittle on Emancipation and Confiscation.

It is claimed by Senator Doolittle and his friends that he has fully and fairly represented the republican sentiment of this state, and that therefore his course should be endorsed by a re-election. If the promise assumed is correct, we admit the justice of the conclusion, while we suppose it will be as freely conceded by the senator and his friends that if he had not fairly represented the republican sentiment he ought not to be re-elected. We accept this issue, and propose to examine the facts a little.

In the first place, we understand it to be conceded by nearly or quite all of the republicans who are in favor of the Senator's re-election, that he has not truly represented the republican party on the question of colonization. Indeed, we doubt whether a dozen republicans can be found in the state who agree with him on this subject; and so far as we know, all the papers but his home organ, which favor his re-election, admit that his scheme of transporting and establishing in a foreign and distant country four millions of human beings, is the most visionary and impracticable which ever entered the brain of man. But to break the force of this admission, and to avoid any injurious effect of it on the Senator's prospects, his supporters claim that it is a non-essential in the republican creed, and that the Senator may be safely indulged in riding this harmless little hobby until he becomes tired of the useless and fatiguing exercise, and dismounts of his own accord. We can imagine the holy horror with which the distinguished Senator raises both hands and rolls up his eyes when he reads this defence, and exclaims: "Save me from my friends!" We doubt whether a more ignominious and refined species of cruelty was ever practiced upon a man by his most wicked enemies than these pretended friends of the senator thus wantonly inflict. Knowing, as we do, the great importance which he attaches to his colonization scheme, we cannot but sympathize with the keen sufferings which he must endure in having his defenders thus "whistle it down the wind" as an insignificant vagary. Why, the Senator believes that he has secured a patent right as the inventor of this great principle in statesmanship; he has made its introduction into practical operation the paramount object of his political life; in its support he has descended to take from the democrats and make his own their most false and wicked proslavery arguments; he has sacrificed republican principles in his political action in the senate, and has alienated his best and truest friends in the republican party. On its success he hangs all his hopes of present greatness, and all his expectation of posthumous fame as a statesman, and yet, forsooth, he is told by his supporters, with almost contemptuous nonchalance, that it is a harmless and absurd delusion, and that he shall be re-elected Senator notwithstanding his belief in it.

But there is another question on which the Senator has been called to act which we presume none of his defenders will attempt to belittle or claim unimportant. That is the confiscation of the slaves of rebels. We believe it is the almost unanimous opinion of the republicans of this state that the only way to effectually put down the rebellion is to destroy slavery, and that the President, in his emancipation policy, should receive the determined and unequivocal support of all true Union men; and yet unless Senator Doolittle has met with another sudden and remarkable change of opinion, he is opposed to that policy of emancipating the slaves of rebels.

In a speech delivered in the senate on the bill "to confiscate the property and free the slaves of rebels," Senator Doolittle has argued that the whole power to free the slaves of rebels rested in the hands of the President as a war power; Senator Doolittle states the position of Senator Browning as follows: "I understand the honorable Senator from Illinois [Mr. Browning] in his speech to say that he believes the President now has power to make these seizures of rebels' slaves and as rebel property, as war measures, and that congress by law cannot enlarge his authority to make him, in short, that such law would give him no more power than he now possesses, still he would not see anything in a bill declaring that the President might exercise that which could not receive the support."

He then goes on to prove that Senator Browning is mistaken, and that the power to confiscate the property, including slaves, of rebels is vested by the constitution exclusively in congress, and that without an act of congress conferring that power on the President, he has no authority to free a single slave; to prove this he cites the case of Brown vs. United States—8 Cranch, 126.

Speaking of the decision of the supreme court of the United States, in that case, he says: "They held that the mere declaration of war not only did not confiscate the property

of rebels, but they held further, that it did not authorize the seizure of enemy's property by the President found within the territory unless congress itself should first by law authorize him to make the seizure. Justice Marshall goes on to say that congress possesses that power, that both under their independent and substantive power to make rules concerning the capture and land and water, congress has the power to declare that enemy's property found within the territory at the breaking out of hostilities might be confiscated. I therefore hold, sir, that under the constitution that congress has power to declare what shall and what shall not be contraband of war and subject to seizure."—Appendix Cong. Globe part 4, page 139-140.

It will thus be seen that the Senator believes that the President has no power to confiscate and set free the slaves of rebels, but that that power is by the constitution conferred on congress alone; and that if the Senator desired the liberation of slaves that he would be in favor of an act of congress for that purpose. But we find him as much opposed to the exercise of this power by congress as he is to the President's exercising it.

In another speech in the senate he said: "What we may constitutionally and justly do to confiscate the property, including slaves, of the leading conspirators upon whom this crime rests, which

"He'll, with all its powers to damn," can hardly punish, I will not now consider; I may do so on some proper occasion hereafter. I will only now say that if we now do just what they charged us with intending to do; if, by one sweeping act of congress, we declare the immediate and unconditional emancipation of all the slaves in all the states, to remain forever within the states against the will of the people in those states, we shall make true every prophecy of our enemies against us, and make false the pledges we made in the canvass of 1860, on which we won the victory, and by which alone we brought this administration into power. This course would make us appear to be false and hypocritical before God and man." For one I will not consent to do it. I say to my friends here, there is no republican on this floor who took part in the canvass of 1860, who did not a hundred times over declare that we had neither the constitutional power nor the purpose to interfere with slavery within the states. How then can we now advocate a doctrine in violation of every pledge we then gave, and on which we came into power? Shall we now make true every charge of our enemies against us, charges which we denounced as false and infamous? Shall we make them true instead of false prophecies by our actions now?—Appendix to Cong. Globe, part 4, page 35.

So that Senator Doolittle is opposed to the confiscation of the slaves of rebels (except of the leading conspirators) either by the President or congress, and unless he has met with a change of heart and been struck with new convictions since he delivered these speeches last spring, he is opposed to the President's emancipation proclamation.

We call upon the republicans of this state to say whether Senator Doolittle has truly represented their sentiments, and whether they are willing to endorse, by his re-election, these pernicious doctrines which he has advocated in the senate. Let them declare whether they want a United States senator of the Browning-Cowan-Harris and Carlisle school, or one who will stand and vote with Sumner, Hale, Wilson, Trumbull and other true republicans.

The Monitor, this week, makes but one faint peep about the "printing," and is entirely silent as to its personal property claimant. What can have stopped the editor's prating about the large amount of taxes he pays? Does \$900 for his "unexcelled" printing office; \$2,500 for his ten and drug store; \$962 for the secured debts due him, look a little inconsistent with his boasted importance as a taxpayer? or does he think the public have been made aware that he is escaping his just share of taxation by a greatly undervalued return of his property? Let us have an explanation on the subject.

This THURSDAY.—The third Sunday in January has been designated as a day when the clergymen of the northwest, without respect of sect, shall be invited to press the claims of our sick and wounded soldiers upon the parishes from their pulpits, and take up collections for the sanitary commission.

NEW YORK CITY DEBT.—The debt of New York city is \$27,000,000. The mayor, in his message, recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for city defenses.

INTERNAL REVENUE—STAMP DUTY.—The following letter from the commissioner of internal revenue will be found of interest to many of our readers:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,  
December 29, 1862.

SIR:—Your letter of the 2d instant has been received.

In reply I will say that when a bond and mortgage, or bond note, and mortgage are given as security for the same debt, each instrument requires its appropriate stamp.

The mortgage, a mortgage stamp for the amount of consideration expressed therein. The bond as a personal bond for a certain sum of money, requires a mortgage stamp of the same denomination as that on the mortgage. The note as a promissory note, requires a bill of exchange (inland) stamp.

Respectfully,  
GEO. S. OUTWELL, Com'r.

To David Atwood, Esq., U. S. Assessor, Madison, Wis.

JEFF DAVIS AND HIS NORTHERN ENEMIES.—Jeff Davis made a speech at Richmond recently, in which he predicted that the north would succumb to the east.

This is the programme of the northern co-operators with the southern rebels, which has recently been developed through such deleterious prints as the Chicago Times. The "lopping off" of New England from the Union, is an idea that none but a deep-dyed traitor could have conceived, and that none but traitors would advocate or favor. It must have originated at Richmond, the design being to "divide the north."

It is evident from Jeff Davis' prediction that the southern rebel leaders and the northern traitor leaders understand each other. They are acting in concert. The northern Tories receive their instructions from Richmond, as much as do the leaders of the rebel armies.

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH REGIMENT.—The 28th regiment has been ordered to report at Memphis, and if not wanted there to move on to Helena, with a probability of going direct to Vicksburg.

They held that the mere declaration of war not only did not confiscate the property

of rebels, but they held further, that it did not authorize the seizure of enemy's property by the President found within the territory unless congress itself should first by law authorize him to make the seizure. Justice Marshall goes on to say that congress possesses that power, that both under their independent and substantive power to make rules concerning the capture and land and water, congress has the power to declare that enemy's property found within the territory at the breaking out of hostilities might be confiscated. I therefore hold, sir, that under the constitution that congress has power to declare what shall and what shall not be contraband of war and subject to seizure."—Appendix Cong. Globe part 4, page 139-140.

It will thus be seen that the Senator believes that the President has no power to confiscate and set free the slaves of rebels, but that that power is by the constitution conferred on congress alone; and that if the Senator desired the liberation of slaves that he would be in favor of an act of congress for that purpose. But we find him as much opposed to the exercise of this power by congress as he is to the President's exercising it.

In another speech in the senate he said: "What we may constitutionally and justly do to confiscate the property, including slaves, of the leading conspirators upon whom this crime rests, which

"He'll, with all its powers to damn," can hardly punish, I will not now consider; I may do so on some proper occasion hereafter. I will only now say that if we now do just what they charged us with intending to do; if, by one sweeping act of congress, we declare the immediate and unconditional emancipation of all the slaves in all the states, to remain forever within the states against the will of the people in those states, we shall make true every prophecy of our enemies against us, and make false the pledges we made in the canvass of 1860, on which we won the victory, and by which alone we brought this administration into power. This course would make us appear to be false and hypocritical before God and man." For one I will not consent to do it. I say to my friends here, there is no republican on this floor who took part in the canvass of 1860, who did not a hundred times over declare that we had neither the constitutional power nor the purpose to interfere with slavery within the states. How then can we now advocate a doctrine in violation of every pledge we then gave, and on which we came into power? Shall we now make true every charge of our enemies against us, charges which we denounced as false and infamous? Shall we make them true instead of false prophecies by our actions now?—Appendix to Cong. Globe, part 4, page 35.

So that Senator Doolittle is opposed to the confiscation of the slaves of rebels (except of the leading conspirators) either by the President or congress, and unless he has met with a change of heart and been struck with new convictions since he delivered these speeches last spring, he is opposed to the President's emancipation proclamation.

We call upon the republicans of this state to say whether Senator Doolittle has truly represented their sentiments, and whether they are willing to endorse, by his re-election, these pernicious doctrines which he has advocated in the senate. Let them declare whether they want a United States senator of the Browning-Cowan-Harris and Carlisle school, or one who will stand and vote with Sumner, Hale, Wilson, Trumbull and other true republicans.

The Monitor, this week, makes but one faint peep about the "printing," and is entirely silent as to its personal property claimant. What can have stopped the editor's prating about the large amount of taxes he pays? Does \$900 for his "unexcelled" printing office; \$2,500 for his ten and drug store; \$962 for the secured debts due him, look a little inconsistent with his boasted importance as a taxpayer? or does he think the public have been made aware that he is escaping his just share of taxation by a greatly undervalued return of his property? Let us have an explanation on the subject.

This THURSDAY.—The third Sunday in January has been designated as a day when the clergymen of the northwest, without respect of sect, shall be invited to press the claims of our sick and wounded soldiers upon the parishes from their pulpits, and take up collections for the sanitary commission.

NEW YORK CITY DEBT.—The debt of New York city is \$27,000,000. The mayor, in his message, recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for city defenses.

INTERNAL REVENUE—STAMP DUTY.—The following letter from the commissioner of internal revenue will be found of interest to many of our readers:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,  
December 29, 1862.

SIR:—Your letter of the 2d instant has been received.

In reply I will say that when a bond and mortgage, or bond note, and mortgage are given as security for the same debt, each instrument requires its appropriate stamp.

The mortgage, a mortgage stamp for the amount of consideration expressed therein. The bond as a personal bond for a certain sum of money, requires a mortgage stamp of the same denomination as that on the mortgage. The note as a promissory note, requires a bill of exchange (inland) stamp.

Respectfully,  
GEO. S. OUTWELL, Com'r.

To David Atwood, Esq., U. S. Assessor, Madison, Wis.

JEFF DAVIS AND HIS NORTHERN ENEMIES.—Jeff Davis made a speech at Richmond recently, in which he predicted that the north would succumb to the east.

This is the programme of the northern co-operators with the southern rebels, which has recently been developed through such deleterious prints as the Chicago Times. The "lopping off" of New England from the Union, is an idea that none but a deep-dyed traitor could have conceived, and that none but traitors would advocate or favor. It must have originated at Richmond, the design being to "divide the north."

It is evident from Jeff Davis' prediction that the southern rebel leaders and the northern traitor leaders understand each other. They are acting in concert. The northern Tories receive their instructions from Richmond, as much as do the leaders of the rebel armies.

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH REGIMENT.—The 28th regiment has been ordered to report at Memphis, and if not wanted there to move on to Helena, with a probability of going direct to Vicksburg.

They held that the mere declaration of war not only did not confiscate the property

of rebels, but they held further, that it did not authorize the seizure of enemy's property by the President found within the territory unless congress itself should first by law authorize him to make the seizure. Justice Marshall goes on to say that congress possesses that power, that both under their independent and substantive power to make rules concerning the capture and land and water, congress has the power to declare that enemy's property found within the territory at the breaking out of hostilities might be confiscated. I therefore hold, sir, that under the constitution that congress has power to declare what shall and what shall not be contraband of war and subject to seizure."—Appendix Cong. Globe part 4, page 139-140.

It will thus be seen that the Senator believes that the President has no power to confiscate and set free the slaves of rebels, but that that power is by the constitution conferred on congress alone; and that if the Senator desired the liberation of slaves that he would be in favor of an act of congress for that purpose. But we find him as much opposed to the exercise of this power by congress as he is to the President's exercising it.

In another speech in the senate he said: "What we may constitutionally and justly do to confiscate the property, including slaves, of the leading conspirators upon whom this crime rests, which

"He'll, with all its powers to damn," can hardly punish, I will not now consider; I may do so on some proper occasion hereafter. I will only now say that if we now do just what they charged us with intending to do; if, by one sweeping act of congress, we declare the immediate and unconditional emancipation of all the slaves in all the states, to remain forever within the states against the will of the people in those states, we shall make true every prophecy of our enemies against us, and make false the pledges we made in the canvass of 1860, on which we won the victory, and by which alone we brought this administration into power. This course would make us appear to be false and hypocritical before God and man." For one I will not consent to do it. I say to my friends here, there is no republican on this floor who took part in the canvass of 1860, who did not a hundred times over declare that we had neither the constitutional power nor the purpose to interfere with slavery within the states. How then can we now advocate a doctrine in violation of every pledge we then gave, and on which we came into power? Shall we now make true every charge of our enemies against us, charges which we denounced as false and infamous? Shall we make them true instead of false prophecies by our actions now?—Appendix to Cong. Globe, part 4, page 35.

So that Senator Doolittle is opposed to the confiscation of the slaves of rebels (except of the leading conspirators) either by the President or congress, and unless he has met with a change of heart and been struck with new convictions since he delivered these speeches last spring, he is opposed to the President's emancipation proclamation.

We call upon the republicans of this state to say whether Senator Doolittle has truly represented their sentiments, and whether they are willing to endorse, by his re-election, these pernicious doctrines which he has advocated in the senate. Let them declare whether they want a United States senator of the Browning-Cowan-Harris and Carlisle school, or one who will stand and vote with Sumner, Hale, Wilson, Trumbull and other true republicans.

The Monitor, this week, makes but one faint peep about the "printing," and is entirely silent as to its personal property claimant. What can have stopped the editor's prating about the large amount of taxes he pays? Does \$900 for his "unexcelled" printing office; \$2,500 for his ten and drug store; \$962 for the secured debts due him, look a little inconsistent with his boasted importance as a taxpayer? or does he think the public have been made aware that he is escaping his just share of taxation by a greatly undervalued return of his property? Let us have an explanation on the subject.

This THURSDAY.—The third Sunday in January has been designated as a day when the clergymen of the northwest, without respect of sect, shall be invited to press the claims of our sick and wounded soldiers upon the parishes from their pulpits, and take up collections for the sanitary commission.

NEW YORK CITY DEBT.—The debt of New York city is \$27,000,000. The mayor, in his message, recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for city defenses.

INTERNAL REVENUE—STAMP DUTY.—The following letter from the commissioner of internal revenue will be found of interest to many of our readers:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,  
December 29, 1862.

SIR:—Your letter of the 2d instant has been received.

In reply I will say that when a bond and mortgage, or bond note, and mortgage are given as security for the same debt, each instrument requires its appropriate stamp.

The mortgage, a mortgage stamp for the amount of consideration expressed therein. The bond as a personal bond for a certain sum of money, requires a mortgage stamp of the same denomination as that on the mortgage. The note as a promissory note, requires a bill of exchange (inland) stamp.

Respectfully,  
GEO. S. OUTWELL, Com'r.

To David Atwood, Esq., U. S. Assessor, Madison, Wis.

JEFF DAVIS AND HIS NORTHERN ENEMIES.—Jeff Davis made a speech at Richmond recently, in which he predicted that the north would succumb to the east.

This is the programme of the northern co-operators with the southern rebels, which has recently been developed through such deleterious prints as the Chicago Times. The "lopping off" of New England from the Union, is an idea that none but a deep-dyed traitor could have conceived, and that none but traitors would advocate or favor. It must have originated at Richmond, the design being to "divide the north."

It is evident from Jeff Davis' prediction that the southern rebel leaders and the northern traitor leaders understand each other. They are acting in concert. The northern Tories receive their instructions from Richmond, as much as do the leaders of the rebel armies.

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH REGIMENT.—The 28th regiment has been ordered to report at Memphis, and if not wanted there to move on to Helena, with a probability of going direct to Vicksburg.

They held that the mere declaration of war not only did not confiscate the property

of rebels, but they held further, that it did not authorize the seizure of enemy's property by the President found within the territory unless congress itself should first by law authorize him to make the seizure. Justice Marshall goes on to say that congress possesses that power, that both under their independent and substantive power to make rules concerning the capture and land and water, congress has the power to declare that enemy's property found within the territory at the breaking out of hostilities might be confiscated. I therefore hold, sir, that under the constitution that congress has power to declare what shall and what shall not be contraband of war and subject to seizure."—Appendix Cong. Globe part 4, page 139-140.

It will thus be seen that the Senator believes that the President has no power to confiscate and set free the slaves of rebels, but that that power is by the constitution conferred on congress alone; and that if the Senator desired the liberation of slaves that he would be in favor of an act of congress for that purpose. But we find him as much opposed to the exercise of this power by congress as he is to the President's exercising it.

In another speech in the senate he said: "What we may constitutionally and justly do to confiscate the property, including slaves, of the leading conspirators upon whom this crime rests, which

"He'll, with all its powers to damn," can hardly punish, I will not now consider; I may do so on some proper occasion hereafter. I will only now say that if we now do just what they charged us with intending to do; if, by one sweeping act of congress, we declare the immediate and unconditional emancipation of all the slaves in all the states, to remain forever within the states against the will of the people in those states, we shall make true every prophecy of our enemies against us, and make false the pledges we made in the canvass of 1860, on which we won the victory, and by which alone we brought this administration into power. This course would make us appear to be false and hypocritical before God and man." For one I will not consent to do it. I say to my friends here, there is no republican on this floor who took part in the canvass of 1860, who did not a hundred times over declare that we had neither the constitutional power nor the purpose to interfere with slavery within the states. How then can we now advocate a doctrine in violation of every pledge we then gave, and on which we came into power? Shall we now make true every charge of our enemies against us, charges which we denounced as false and infamous? Shall we make them true instead of false prophecies by our actions now?—Appendix to Cong. Globe, part 4, page 35.

So that Senator Doolittle is opposed to the confiscation of the slaves of rebels (except of the leading conspirators) either by the President or congress, and unless he has met with a change of heart and been struck with new convictions since he delivered these speeches last spring, he is opposed to the President's emancipation proclamation.

We call upon the republicans of this state to say whether Senator Doolittle has truly represented their sentiments, and whether they are willing to endorse, by his re-election, these pernicious doctrines which he has advocated in the senate. Let them declare whether they want a United States senator of the Browning-Cowan-Harris and Carlisle school, or one who will stand and vote with Sumner, Hale, Wilson, Trumbull and other true republicans.

The Monitor, this week, makes but one faint peep about the "printing," and is entirely silent as to its personal property claimant. What can have stopped the editor's prating about the large amount of taxes he pays? Does \$900 for his "unexcelled" printing office; \$2,500 for his ten and drug store; \$962 for the secured debts due him, look a little inconsistent with his boasted importance as a taxpayer? or does he think the public have been made aware that he is escaping his just share of taxation by a greatly undervalued return of his property? Let us have an explanation on the subject.

This THURSDAY.—The third Sunday in January has been designated as a day when the clergymen of the northwest, without respect of sect, shall be invited to press the claims of our sick and wounded soldiers upon the parishes from their pulpits, and take up collections for the sanitary commission.

NEW YORK CITY DEBT.—The debt of New York city is \$27,000,000. The mayor, in his message, recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for city defenses.

INTERNAL REVENUE—STAMP DUTY.—The following letter from the commissioner of internal revenue will be found of interest to many of our readers:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,  
December 29, 1862.

SIR:—Your letter of the 2d instant has been received.

In reply I will say that when a bond and mortgage, or bond note, and mortgage are given as security for the same debt, each instrument requires its appropriate stamp.

The mortgage, a mortgage stamp for the amount of consideration expressed therein. The bond as a personal bond for a certain sum of money, requires a mortgage stamp of the same denomination as that on the mortgage. The note as a promissory note, requires a bill of exchange (inland) stamp.

Respectfully,  
GEO. S. OUTWELL, Com'r.

To David Atwood, Esq., U. S. Assessor, Madison, Wis.

JEFF DAVIS AND HIS NORTHERN ENEMIES.—Jeff Davis made a speech at Richmond recently, in which he predicted that the north would succumb to the east.

This is the programme of the northern co-operators with the southern rebels, which has recently been developed through such deleterious prints as the Chicago Times. The "lopping off" of New England from the Union, is an idea that none but a deep-dyed traitor could have conceived, and that none but traitors would advocate or favor. It must have originated at Richmond, the design being to "divide the north."

It is evident from Jeff Davis' prediction that the southern rebel leaders and the northern traitor leaders understand each other. They are acting in concert. The northern Tories receive their instructions from Richmond, as much as do the leaders of the rebel armies.

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH REGIMENT.—The 28th regiment has been ordered to report at Memphis, and if not wanted there to move on to Helena, with a probability of going direct to Vicksburg.

They held that the mere declaration of war not only did not confiscate the property

of rebels, but they held further, that it did not authorize the seizure of enemy's property by the President found within the territory unless congress itself should first by law authorize him to make the seizure. Justice Marshall goes on to say that congress possesses that power, that both under their independent and substantive power to make rules concerning the capture and land and water, congress has the power to declare that enemy's property found within the territory at the breaking out of hostilities might be confiscated. I therefore hold, sir, that under the constitution that congress has power to declare what shall and what shall not be contraband of war and subject to seizure."—Appendix Cong. Globe part 4, page 139-140.

It will thus be seen that the Senator believes that the President has no power to confiscate and set free the slaves of rebels, but that that power is by the constitution conferred on congress alone; and that if the Senator desired the liberation of slaves that he would be in favor of an act of congress for that purpose. But we find him as much opposed to the exercise of this power by congress as he is to the President's exercising it.

In another speech in the senate he said: "What we may constitutionally and justly do to confiscate the property, including slaves, of the leading conspirators upon whom this crime rests, which

"He'll, with all its powers to damn," can hardly punish, I will not now consider; I may do so on some proper occasion hereafter. I will only now say that if we now do just what they charged us with intending to do; if, by one sweeping act of congress, we declare the immediate and unconditional emancipation of all the slaves in all the states, to remain forever within the states against the will of the people in those states, we shall make true every prophecy of our enemies against us, and make false the pledges we made in the canvass of 1860, on which we won the victory, and by which alone we brought this administration into power. This course would make us appear to be false and hypocritical before God and man." For one I will not consent to do it. I say to my friends here, there is no republican on this floor who took part in the canvass of 1860, who did not a hundred times over declare that we had neither the constitutional power nor the purpose to interfere with slavery within the states. How then can we now advocate a doctrine in violation of every pledge we then gave, and on which we came into power? Shall we now make true every charge of our enemies against us, charges which we denounced as false and infamous? Shall we make them true instead of false prophecies by our actions now?—Appendix to Cong. Globe, part 4, page 35.

So that Senator Doolittle is opposed to the confiscation of the slaves of rebels (except of the leading conspirators) either by the President or congress, and unless he has met with a change of heart and been struck with new convictions since he delivered these speeches last spring, he is opposed to the President's emancipation proclamation.

We call upon the republicans of this state to say whether Senator Doolittle has truly represented their sentiments, and whether they are willing to endorse, by his re-election, these pernicious doctrines which he has advocated in the senate. Let them declare whether they want a United States senator of the Browning-Cowan-Harris and Carlisle school, or one who will stand and vote with Sumner, Hale, Wilson, Trumbull and other true republicans.

The Monitor, this week, makes but one faint peep about the "printing," and is entirely silent as to its personal property claimant. What can have stopped the editor's prating about the large amount of taxes he pays? Does \$900 for his "unexcelled" printing office; \$2,500 for his ten and drug store; \$962 for the secured debts due him, look a little inconsistent with his boasted importance as a taxpayer? or does he think the public have been made aware that he is escaping his just share of taxation by a greatly undervalued return of his property? Let us have an explanation on the subject.

This THURSDAY.—The third Sunday in January has been designated as a day when the clergymen of the northwest, without respect of sect, shall be invited to press the claims of our sick and wounded soldiers upon the parishes from their pulpits, and take up collections for the sanitary commission.

NEW YORK CITY DEBT.—The debt of New York city is \$27,000,000. The mayor, in his message, recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for city defenses.

INTERNAL REVENUE—STAMP DUTY.—The following letter from the commissioner of internal revenue will be found of interest to many of our readers:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,  
December 29, 1862.

SIR:—Your letter of the 2d instant has been received.

In reply I will say that when a bond and mortgage, or bond note, and mortgage are given as security for the same debt, each instrument requires its appropriate stamp.

The mortgage, a mortgage stamp for the amount of consideration expressed therein. The bond as a personal bond for a certain sum of money, requires a mortgage stamp of the same denomination as that on the mortgage. The note as a promissory note, requires a bill of exchange (inland) stamp.

Respectfully,  
GEO. S. OUTWELL, Com'r.

To David Atwood, Esq., U. S. Assessor, Madison, Wis.

JEFF DAVIS AND HIS NORTHERN ENEMIES.—Jeff Davis made a speech at Richmond recently, in which he predicted that the north would succumb to the east.

This is the programme of the northern co-operators with the southern rebels, which has recently been developed through such deleterious prints as the Chicago Times. The "lopping off" of New England from the Union, is an idea that none but a deep-dyed traitor could have conceived, and that none but traitors would advocate or favor. It must have originated at Richmond, the design being to "divide the north."

It is evident from Jeff Davis' prediction that the southern rebel leaders and the northern traitor leaders understand each other. They are acting in concert. The northern Tories receive their instructions from Richmond, as much as do the leaders of the rebel armies.

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH REGIMENT.—The 28th regiment has been ordered to report at Memphis, and if not wanted there to move on to Helena, with a probability of going direct to Vicksburg.

They held that the mere declaration of war not only did not confiscate the property

of rebels, but they held further, that it did not authorize the seizure of enemy's property by the President found within the territory unless congress itself should first by law authorize him to make the seizure. Justice Marshall goes on to say that congress possesses that power, that both under their independent and substantive power to make rules concerning the capture and land and water, congress has the power to declare that enemy's property found within the territory at the breaking out of hostilities might be confiscated. I therefore hold, sir, that under the constitution that congress has power to declare what shall and what shall not be contraband of war and subject to seizure."—Appendix Cong. Globe part 4, page 139-140.

It will thus be seen that the Senator believes that the President has no power to confiscate and set free the slaves of rebels, but that that power is by the constitution conferred on congress alone; and that if the Senator desired the liberation of slaves that he would be in favor of an act of congress for that purpose. But we find him as much opposed to the exercise of this power by congress as he is to the President's exercising it.















Beth Bennett, Thomas Alney and Mary  
his wife.  
The State of Wisconsin to Nathaniel H. Bennet

**YOU** are hereby summoned and required to  
the office of the clerk of the circuit court  
county, at the city of Jacksonville in said county  
13th day of November, 1902, and a copy of  
herewith served on you, and to serve a copy  
answer to said complaint, on the subscribers, office in said city, within twenty days after the  
of this summons on you, exclusive of the day of  
service, and if you fail to answer the said copy  
within the time aforesaid, the plaintiff in this  
will apply to the court for the relief demanded  
complaint.—BARNETT, CASHBODAY & GIBBS  
—BARNETT, CASHBODAY & GIBBS  
—BARNETT, CASHBODAY & GIBBS

STATE OF WISCONSIN.  
ROCK COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT.  
Joseph P. Willard, plaintiff, Elizabeth A. Willard,  
Charles O. Plimpton, defendants.  
IN pursuance and by virtue of a judgment  
of closure and sale rendered in the above titled  
case on the 23d day of March, 1885, by Judge  
Cassatuck, a referee duly appointed for such  
said court, will sell at public auction, to the  
highest bidder, at the front door of the Central Bank  
of Janesville, in said county, on  
THURSDAY, THE 15th DAY OF MARCH NEXT,  
at ten o'clock in the forenoon, the following de-  
scribed real estate, to-wit: Lots 1 and 2, in  
town 10 north, range 10 west, section 36, in  
county and state of Wisconsin, and known and  
designated as lot number four (4) in a plat of  
lot number one (1) of Mitchell's addition to  
the city of Janesville, in said county, on

[illegible]

The sale of the above described property to take place on Monday, the 16th day of January, 1922, at 10 o'clock of the forenoon, at the store and warehouse of the undersigned, to-wit:

625323m H. A. JENKS, JR.

**Sheriff's Mortgage Sale.**

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

CIRCUIT COURT OF THE COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE.

Lawie Taylor, plaintiff, against Alexander A. John, et al.

John A. Gray, Anna M. Gray and Frances A. John, defendants.

Wherefore the undersigned, as a judgment creditor and sale rendered in the above case on the 13th day of December, A. D. 1921, in which the said John, et al., were the parties named defendants, I will sell at public auction, to-wit: at the store and warehouse of the undersigned, to-wit:

625323m H. A. JENKS, JR.

**THE 30 DAY OF FEBRUARY, A. D. 1922,**

at 10 O'CLOCK A. M. of that day, the following interest in real estate, to-wit: a certain lot or lots of land situated in the city of Janesville, in the county of Wisconsin, and parcel described as follows, to-wit:

Lot 1, block 1, of the subdivision of block one hundred and one, of the addition of the said city of Janesville, in the county of Janesville, in the state of Wisconsin, (the subdivision of block one hundred and one, of the addition of the said city of Janesville, in the county of Janesville, in the state of Wisconsin, as shown on the plat of said subdivision, recorded plat of the same, or so much thereof as may be necessary to satisfy the said mortgage, with interest and the sale of this real estate.

10th, 1902. E. J. M. PUTNAM  
FISCHELS, LYONS & MILLER, Attorneys at Law,  
New York City.

**Sherrill's Sale.**  
CIRCUIT COURT, ROCK COUNTY.  
(George M. Murray against Eugene P. Kendall,  
Hull, Hall, and Thos. Tuttle.)

IN pursuance and in virtue of a judgment  
of the said court, made in said case, the  
entitled sale, on the 6th day of December  
last, of said plaintiff and against said  
defendant, was held at public auction, to the highest  
bidder, of the tract of land, situate in the city  
of Sherrill, Rock county, Wisconsin, in the city  
of Sherrill, Rock county, Wisconsin.

**THE 31st DAY OF MARCH, 1903,**  
at 10 o'clock A. M. of that day, the following  
mortgaged premises, to wit: all those tracts  
of land situate and being in the city of Sherrill,  
Rock county, Wisconsin, and containing

**SHERIFF'S SALE.**

**IN CIRCUIT COURT FOR ROCK COUNTY**  
S D Circuit, pl'r vs Jeremiah Smith, def.  
**B**y said court, leaving day for sale  
of said premises, to wit: one-half of  
lot six, each in favor of said plaintiff and ag-  
ainst said defendant, to-wit: one-half of lot  
six, and to me directed and to my heirs and as-  
signs, shall sell at public auction, to the highest  
bidder,

**ON THE 14th DAY OF FEBRUARY,**  
at the hour of 10 o'clock A M of that day, at  
the Court House of Rock County, Wisconsin,  
county, all the right, title and interest which

defendant, Jeremiah Moriarty, had on the April, 1857, or at any time thereafter in and following described real estate, to wit: a certain parcel of land in the city of Jacksonville, the county of Duval, state of Wisconsin, described as follows, to wit: Beginning at a point on the east line of said street twenty-two feet easterly from the corner of lot No eight in Smith, Bailey & Co's addition to Jacksonville, thence easterly along said line of said Pleasant street twenty-two feet, thence by parallel with latter street across said lot twenty-two feet on lot seven in said addition westerly parallel with said Pleasant street twenty-two feet to the east line of land sold to Henry N. Nye southerly along said east line of said land to the place to the place of beginning.—Dated 5th day of May, 1887. J. M. PUTN.

**CIRCUIT COURT FOR ROCK COUNTY**  
Levia Ward, plff, ass't Piny Allen, Louisa  
Harriet J. Benedict, de'ts.  
In remembrance and by virtue of a judgment  
of the court in the above entitled cause, rendered in  
action on the 6th day of June, 1890, in and to  
be public notice, to the highest bidder, at  
door of the Rock County Bank, in the city  
in, in said county, on

**THE 10th DAY OF JANUARY**  
at 2 o'clock, in the forenoon, all those parcels  
situate in the county of Rock and state of Wis-  
consin, and described as follows: the east half of  
the east quarter and the southwest quarter of  
the east quarter of section ten (10), and the north-  
east quarter of the southeast quarter of the north  
quarter of the southwest quarter of section eleven  
township one (1) north, of range forty (40) N.

so much thereof as shall be necessary to the amount due by virtue of said judgment.—December 4th, 1862.

S. M. PUTNEY,  
Attorney.  
Sheriff of Rock County.

**CIRCUIT COURT—ROCK COUNTY.**  
J. Fifield and D. E. Fifield agt. O. B. Mattison Cutting.

The State of Wisconsin to the above named  
debtor:

**YOU** are hereby summoned and required to  
appear in the complaint in this action, which was  
filed in the office of the clerk of the circuit court  
recently, at the city of Janesville in said county  
19th day of November, 1862, and a copy of

**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19**, at 10 o'clock, in the forenoon, to wit: last day of the month of February, 1916, four in black number fifty; also lot number thirty-four in black number eighty-one.

**CIRCUIT COURT POOL HOOK COUNTY**  
**F B Barrows, plaintiff, O O Mattison and**  
**others, defendants.**  
**The State of Wisconsin to the said defendants**  
**and H F Cutting:**  
 You are hereby summoned and required to  
 answer the complaint filed in this action  
 was filed in the office of the clerk of said court  
 at Janesville, Rock county, Wis. within, on or  
 before the 10th day of April, 1902, and to  
 serve a copy of your answer to each of the  
 said plaintiffs, on the undersigned, at  
 Janesville, Wisconsin, within the time  
 specified, or the service of said copy of your  
 answer here, exclusive of the day of such  
 service, and if you fail to answer the said complaint  
 within the time specified, or the service of  
 said copy of your answer here, exclusive of the  
 judgment against you for the sum of two hun-  
 dred and fifty dollars, with interest on two

WILLARD MERRILL  
 do:9dtw Plaintiff's Attorney, Jamesville

**Instructions for Field Artists**  
 Forens. [au25dtf] O. J. DEAR

NEWSPAPERARCHIVE®



